



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,365	05/26/2000	Stephen Dao Hui Hsu	004828.P001	8126
7590 10/31/2007 MEYERTONS HOOD KIVLIN KOWERT & GOETZEL PC 700 LAVACA SUITE 800 AUSTIN, TX 78701-3102			EXAMINER TRAN, TONGOC	
		ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER	
		MAIL DATE 10/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/580,365	HSU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tongoc Tran	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 73-92 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 73-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on August 16, 2007. Claims 73-92 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Response to Applicant's remarks on pages 7-9 with respect to claim 73. Applicant contends that the cited prior art, Obenhufer and Farah do not teach the limitations of:

"wherein said decrypted data includes a request for a web page accessible via a second Internet domain that is different from the first Internet domain, wherein said request includes both an encrypted address of said web page and an unencrypted address that is within a third Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain". Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Col. 5, lines 44-51, Obenhufer discloses incoming or outgoing data packets are checked against a proxy table to determine whether to route forward the data packet or to drop the data packet (also see Fig. 7). Farah discloses preventive measure for anti-prying in the WWW to prevent any from spy at what another user is browsing at the moment by intercepting his packets and looking at their content ("sniffing") (Farah, Introduction, page 1). Farah discloses both URLs and content transferred are to be encrypted/decrypted using the ROT13 mechanism (Farah, page 2, first paragraph). If the data packet is destined for the internet through a proxy and the role of a commonly

known proxy server is acting on behalf of a third party. Therefore, it would have been obvious that when the client (from third domain) to the proxy server (first domain) requesting webpage from a different server (second domain) where the URL of the webpage would benefit from being encrypted because it would contain user's browsing information that is needed to take preventive measure from being spying as taught by Farah. In addition, it is common that the sender (the client), the receiver (the proxy) and the resource (webpage) are commonly contained in the data packet and would have been obvious that the client, the proxy and the source each located in a different domain. Therefore, in light of this interpretation of the claimed limitation and the cited prior art. Examiner maintains the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 73-77 and 79-84 and 89-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638) in view of Farah ("Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol-UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network Working Group", pages 1-5).

In respect claims 73, 74, 76, 81-84, 89 and 90, Obenhuber discloses a method, a server system and a computer-readable memory medium comprising:

At a server outside of a firewall, receiving over a secure connection, encrypted data from a computer behind said firewall (see Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 1-50), wherein said server is accessible via a first Internet domain, wherein said receiving over said secure connection includes decrypting said encrypted data according to a protocol specified by said secure connection to produce encrypted data, said server decrypting the encrypted address of the web page; responsive to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain; and said server sending data to said computer over the secure connection via the firewall, wherein said sending data includes encrypting said data, wherein said encrypted data includes said retrieved web page (see col. 4, lines 20-35).

Obenhuber does not disclose wherein the request includes both an encrypted address of the web page and an unencrypted address of a third Internet domain that is different from said second Internet domain. However, Farah discloses encrypting the URL address or partially encrypting the URL address (see Farrah, pages 2-3). Furthermore,

Official Notice is taken that URL address containing addresses from at least one domains (e.g. URL that contains source host with partner site). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the partial encryption of Farrah by encrypting the webpage in the URL in order to protect the directory of the requested files.

In respect to claims 75 and 91, Obenhuber and Farrah do not disclose wherein the third Internet domain is the same as the first Internet domain. However, it is old and well known to include returned address in the file request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to concatenate the returned url of the user request in the request in unencrypted form taught by Farrah's partial encrypted URL as a matter of design.

In respect to claim 77, Obenhuber further discloses wherein said protocol specified by said secure connection is SSL (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

In respect to claims 79 and 92, Obenhuber does not disclose providing advertisement to the computer. However, Official Notice is taken that providing advertisement to the computer over the Internet in exchange for service provided is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement advertising feature to Obenhuber's customer system in order to exchange for service provided.

In respect to claim 80, Obenhuber further discloses providing information regarding one or more web pages requested by said computer to one or more third parties (see col. 4, lines 1-9).

4. Claims 78 and 85-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638) in view of Farah ("Encrypted

Hypertext Transfer Protocol-UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network Working Group", pages 1-5) and further in view of Subramaniam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,302, hereinafter Subramaniam).

In respect to claims 78 and 85-88, Obenhuber does not disclose modifying computer code associated with the retrieved web page to cause subsequent requests from the computer that are related to the retrieved web page to be sent to the third Internet domain instead of the second internet domain. However, Subramaniam discloses redirection capability to redirect from one domain to another domain (see col. 9, lines 22-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the redirection signal taught by Subramaniam with Obenhuber's providing users with access to public work for the benefit of promoting the use of secure connection (see col. 9, lines 23-25).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached at (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TT


KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER